

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-14 are pending and rejected. Claims 1 and 3 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 112 is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection of claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 under 35 USC § 112.

#### **Formal Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for previously accepting the drawing and acknowledging that certified copies of the priority document have been received.

#### **Specification**

The Examiner objected to claims 9-14, alleging that the claim terminology “computer-readable medium” fails to have antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 9 recites a “computer-readable medium.” Applicant submits that claims 9-14 are proper.

Further clarification of the objection or a withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (6519241 B1), in view of Hauduc et al. (6993568 B1), and further in view of Shi et al. (7032003 B1).**

Theimer and Hauduc, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest claims 1-14.

Claim 1 recites a device for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the device comprising an embedded web server, for displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser of a telecommunication system, driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, displaying data of a selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command and updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, a CGI/ASP program of server driven by the embedded web server to generate a command for communication between the mobile

telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser, a homepage of the mobile telephone, for displaying information management menus of the mobile telephone and including a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language, and a memory, for storing data of the information management menus.

Theimer discloses performing communication between web servers and web browsers/other servers through CGI (see col. 1, lines 16-26 of Theimer). However, Theimer fails to disclose an embedded web server driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and a telecommunication system using the web browser, displaying data of a selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command and updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 2 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable base claim 1.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, the Examiner alleges that Theimer and Hauduc teach all features of the claims 3 and 9 except the data synchronization method between the mobile telephone and the web browser, and relies on Shi to disclose the data synchronize method between the mobile telephone and the web browser.

Theimer discloses performing communication between web servers and web browsers/other servers through CGI, and claims 1-13 of Shi merely disclose the feature of transmitting synchronization request message from the wireless computing device to a server, updating remote data on the server, generating synchronization response message based on the updated results, and transmitting the synchronization response message to the wireless computing device.

Regarding claim 3, Theimer, Hauduc and Shi, alone or in any combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest when one menu is selected from the information management menus, driving, by an embedded web server of the mobile phone, a CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and displaying data of the selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command, as recited in claim 3.

Regarding claim 9, Theimer, Hauduc and Shi, alone or in any combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest driving, by an embedded web server of the mobile phone, a CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and updating the same data in the mobile telephone according to the command, as described in claim 9.

Claims 4-8 and 10-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 3 and 9, respectively.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2009



Gautam Sain  
Reg. No. 57,805

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680  
Main: (202) 659-9076